

Middlesex University Research Repository

An open access repository of

Middlesex University research

<http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk>

Yeung, Wing-Chun V., Bishop, Chris ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1505-1287>, Turner, Anthony N. ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5121-432X> and Maloney, Sean J. (2021) Does a loaded warm-up
influence jump asymmetry and badminton-specific change of direction performance?
International Journal of Sports Physiology and Performance, 16 (4) . pp. 578-584. ISSN
1555-0265 [Article] (doi:10.1123/ijsp.2020-0313)

Final accepted version (with author's formatting)

This version is available at: <https://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/30239/>

Copyright:

Middlesex University Research Repository makes the University's research available electronically.

Copyright and moral rights to this work are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners unless otherwise stated. The work is supplied on the understanding that any use for commercial gain is strictly forbidden. A copy may be downloaded for personal, non-commercial, research or study without prior permission and without charge.

Works, including theses and research projects, may not be reproduced in any format or medium, or extensive quotations taken from them, or their content changed in any way, without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). They may not be sold or exploited commercially in any format or medium without the prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

Full bibliographic details must be given when referring to, or quoting from full items including the author's name, the title of the work, publication details where relevant (place, publisher, date), pagination, and for theses or dissertations the awarding institution, the degree type awarded, and the date of the award.

If you believe that any material held in the repository infringes copyright law, please contact the Repository Team at Middlesex University via the following email address:

eprints@mdx.ac.uk

The item will be removed from the repository while any claim is being investigated.

See also repository copyright: re-use policy: <http://eprints.mdx.ac.uk/policies.html#copy>

DOES A LOADED WARM-UP INFLUENCE JUMP ASYMMETRY AND BADMINTON-SPECIFIC CHANGE OF DIRECTION PERFORMANCE?

Wing-Chun V. Yeung¹, Chris Bishop¹, Anthony N. Turner¹, Sean J. Maloney¹

¹ Faculty of Science and Technology, London Sport Institute, Middlesex University,
London, United Kingdom

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Sean Maloney, Faculty of Science and Technology, London Sport Institute, Middlesex
University, London, United Kingdom S.Maloney@mdx.ac.uk +44 7800 810099

TYPE OF ARTICLE: Original Investigation

RUNNING HEAD: Loaded warm-up, asymmetry & CODS

KEYWORDS: Agility, Imbalance, Post-Activation Potentiation, Multidirectional, Speed

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: No benefits in any form have been or will be received from any commercial party/grant body related directly or indirectly in relation to this manuscript.

ABSTRACT WORD COUNT: 204

TEXT WORD COUNT: 3253

NUMBER OF TABLES: 5

ABSTRACT

Purpose: Previously, it has been shown that loaded warm-up (LWU) can improve change of direction speed (CODS) in professional badminton players. However, the effect of asymmetry on CODS in badminton players and the influence of LWU on asymmetry has not been examined. **Methods:** Twenty-one amateur badminton players (age: 29.5 ± 8.4 ; playing experience: 8.4 ± 4.2 years) completed two trials. In the first, they performed a control warm-up (CWU). In the second, they performed the same warm-up but with three exercises loaded with a weight vest (LWU). Following both warm-ups, players completed single leg jump (SLCMJ) and badminton-specific CODS tests. **Results:** No significant differences between CWU and LWU were observed for CODS, SLCMJ or SLCMJ asymmetry. However, small effect sizes suggested faster CODS (mean difference: -5%; $d = -0.32$) and lower asymmetries (mean difference: -3%; $d = -0.39$) following LWU. Five players (24%) experienced CODS improvements greater than the minimum detectable change whilst two (10%) responded negatively. Asymmetry was not correlated with CODS following CWU ($\rho = 0.079$; $p = 0.733$) but was negatively associated with CODS after LWU ($\rho = -0.491$; $p = 0.035$). **Conclusion:** LWU may prove a strategy to trial on an individual basis but generic recommendations should not be applied.

INTRODUCTION

A dynamic warm-up has been widely demonstrated to elicit acute improvements in speed/power performance.¹ However, the addition of specific ‘pre-conditioning’ activities to a warm-up may further augment improvements in performance. Previously reported as the post-activation potentiation phenomenon, this is perhaps more correctly termed as post-activation performance enhancement (PAPE) as electrically evoked contractile properties are not typically assessed.^{2,3} As the performance of heavy resistance exercise is likely to be contraindicated prior to competition in most instances, the performance of certain ballistic activities may provide coaches with method by which to induce PAPE which can be easily applied.⁴

In the sport of badminton, the ability to quickly change direction is an important determinant of performance.⁵ For example, Tiwari et al.⁶ noted a significant relationship ($r = -0.83$; $p < 0.05$) between change of direction speed (CODS) and winning percentage in Indian state-level players. As such, the acute augmentation CODS is likely to be advantageous to performance. Zois et al.⁷ demonstrated that a heavy (5RM) leg press stimulus improved reactive agility performance by 5% (effect size [ES] = 1.1 ± 0.7) in soccer players. As these were observed alongside improvements in jump and sprint performance,⁷ it is likely that changes in physical capacities underpin such augmentations. However, as previously noted, this form of pre-conditioning activity is unlikely to be possible prior to on-court competition in badminton.

In their review article, Maloney et al.⁴ concluded that performing ballistic activities (such as jumps and changes of direction) with additional load may increase the potential PAPE response. This is most commonly achieved through the performance of exercises whilst wearing a weighted vest. Several studies have reported performance improvements following a loaded warm up (LWU),⁸⁻¹² although such augmentations have not always been observed.¹³ Importantly, Simperingham et al.¹² noted that loading the specific movement patterns in which augmentations are desired – for example, loaded acceleration to improve subsequent acceleration performance, is likely to be more effective than loading more generic movements such as jumps. This strategy will facilitate the rehearsal of specific patterns and provide overload within specific force-vectors.¹²

To the authors’ knowledge, two investigations have sought to determine the efficacy of a weight vest LWU on CODS. In a population of eight professional badminton players, Maloney et al.¹⁴ reported that additional loads of 5 and 10% of body mass significantly improved the performance of a badminton-specific CODS task over an unloaded control (5%: ES = 0.39; 10%: ES = 0.83), but did report an effect on jump performance. Turki et al.¹⁵ examined the effect of loadings equivalent to 5, 10 and 15% on a repeated CODS task in young (age: 18 ± 0.88) soccer players. The authors reported that all three loading conditions improved fastest (1.31-1.58%) and total (1.89-1.98%) CODS times compared to an unloaded control with no difference between loadings.

Currently, the relationship between asymmetry and athletic performance is not clear.¹⁶ Specifically, asymmetries in single leg countermovement jump (SLCMJ) height have been correlated with impaired CODS in youth tennis players¹⁷, and academy soccer players,¹⁸ but not in youth handball players,^{19,20} female soccer players,²¹ or in a mixed cohort of professional soccer and cricket players.²² However, the influence of asymmetry on CODS performance in badminton players has not been evaluated. Badminton is a highly unilateral-biased sport where asymmetry is to be expected given longstanding participation in the sport.²³ Whilst it may be reasonable to hypothesise that asymmetries would not be associated with deleterious performance effects in this

population, such assertions require empirical support. Moreover, the influence of acute interventions on asymmetry has not been explored.

The current study aimed to evaluate the acute effects of dynamic warm-up with a weighted vest on CODS, and SLCMJ asymmetry in badminton players. It was hypothesised that the LWU would significantly improve CODS, but not SLCMJ asymmetry.

METHOD

Subjects

Twenty-one amateur badminton players (18 male, 3 female; age: 29.5 ± 8.4 ; stature: 1.75 ± 0.12 m; body mass: 74.0 ± 13.7 kg; self-reported playing history: 8.4 ± 4.2 years) provided written informed consent to participate in the study. A minimum of 21 participants were required according to *a priori* power analyses (G*Power 3.1, Heinrich-Heine Universität, Düsseldorf, Germany), based on effect size of 0.5¹⁴ and power of 0.8.²⁴ In order to minimise the possibility of any learning effect during investigation, all participants were required to have >3 years' competitive playing experience (competing in Badminton England sanctioned events) to ensure they were adequately skilled in badminton footwork/movement pattern, and have been free from injury for >3 months preceding the study. All players had previously performed the SLCMJ and CODS tests employed in the study. All procedures were approved by the ethics committee of the relevant University.

Design

The current study employed a repeated-measures design to determine the effect of a LWU on CODS and asymmetry in amateur badminton players. All data were collected across two testing sessions: first, a control warm-up (CWU) session, and second, and LWU session. These were performed on two separate days separated by one week. The same dynamic warm-up protocol (Table 1) was performed in both conditions, however, the final exercises (exercises 20-22) in the LWU condition were performed with a weight vest (10% body mass); this loading has been shown to improve CODS performance in elite badminton players.¹⁴ Post warm-up, players sequentially performed SLCMJ, then badminton-specific CODS tests.

*** Table 1 Near Here ***

Procedures

The investigation consisted of two testing sessions, a control condition (normal dynamic warm-up; CWU) and an experimental condition (LWU). An overview of the study is shown in Figure 1. In both sessions, participants performed the same warm-up protocol (detailed below) and performance assessments. All testing sessions were executed on the same indoor badminton courts. Participants were requested not to engage in any vigorous exercise for 48 hours prior to testing and to avoid caffeine intake for two hours before each session. Despite the intention to counterbalance the order of conditions, this was not possible as the weight vests were not available during the first testing session.

*** Figure 1 Near Here ***

All participants performed a badminton-focused dynamic warm-up (Table 1) previously outlined by Maloney et al.¹⁴ The warm-up protocol consisted of 22 exercises, progressing from low to high intensity movements. During exercises 1-19, participants jogged one width of a full-size badminton court (equivalent to 6.1 meters), performed the specific exercise over another court, and then jogged across a third court (~20 m total owing to the space between courts). Participants turned around and repeated this for the following exercise. In LWU, the weight vest was worn for the performance of exercises 20-22. The weight vest (Surreal UK, United Kingdom) was loaded

with an equivalent of 10% of participants' body mass (mean \pm SD: 7.4 ± 1.4 kg) to the nearest 0.2 kg based upon previous investigations.^{14,15} No vest was worn in the control condition.

Following the warm-up, participants performed up to three familiarisation trials for SLCMJ and CODS assessments (outlined below) at ~80% effort. A three-minute recovery period was provided following the last familiarisation trial and first assessment trial. Each assessment was performed three times, each separated by a 60-second recovery period to minimize fatigue.

SLCMJ assessment

Unilateral countermovement jump height was measured employing a SLCMJ protocol which was standardised with a study investigated jumping asymmetries on academy junior soccer players.^{18,20} Participants began the test standing in the centre of a contact mat (Jump Mat, FSL Scoreboards, United Kingdom) with hands on hips. The foot of the non-testing leg was instructed to be positioned at mid-shin height of the testing leg. Participants were instructed to jump as high as possible during each assessment trial but permitted to use a self-selected depth and velocity in the countermovement. Hands were required to remain on hips throughout. Landings were performed on the same limb, but participants were not required to 'stick' the landing and hold the position. All participants started testing on their left-side with trials alternating between left and right limbs thereafter.

CODS assessment

CODS was evaluated using a badminton-specific protocol proposed by Paterson et al.²⁵ The test (shown in Figure 2) required participants to move from a rectangle positioned in centre court to eight consecutive perimeter locations with self-selected footwork, touch the marked point with their racket, and then return to centre court between each location. The testing setup was reversed for the left-handed participant ($n = 1$). The time started when one foot left the centre court rectangle and stopped when one foot returned to the rectangle after the eighth movement. As a contact mat permitting time measurements was unavailable for use in the current study, the CODS test was timed using a handheld stopwatch. Given the relatively long duration of the test (group mean: 16-17 seconds), this was deemed acceptable. Handheld timing was also employed in a similar CODS test and demonstrated strong intra- and inter-session reliability (ICC = 0.88 and 0.94, respectively).¹⁴

*** Figure 2 Near Here ***

Statistical Analyses

Asymmetry was determined from the SLCMJ test using mean jump heights from the dominant (D) and non-dominant (ND) limbs with dominance defined by racket hand. For all participants this represented their lunging leg. The asymmetry index (%) was calculated as outlined by Bishop et al.²⁶: (max value – min value) / max value * 100. To determine 'performance' for each test within each condition, the best score was used.

All data were initially recorded in Microsoft Excel (Version 16.16 Mac OSX, Microsoft Office, Washington, USA) and later transferred to SPSS (Version 25.0, IBM, New York, USA) for further statistical analyses. Statistical significance for all tests were set at an alpha level of $p \leq 0.05$. Shapiro-Wilk tests were applied to assess for normality of each variable.

The intra-session reliability of each measurement was determined in both the control and experimental conditions using three measures. Firstly, two-way random intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) with absolute agreement were calculated and interpreted using the thresholds outlined by Koo and Li²⁷ where >0.9 = “excellent”. Second, the coefficient of variation (CV) $[(SD/mean) \times 100]$ was determined. The CV was considered acceptable if $<10\%$.²⁸ Finally, the standard error of measurement (SEM) $[SD \times \sqrt{(1-ICC)}]$ was calculated.

To evaluate differences in variables between CWU and LWU conditions, either paired-sample T-tests or Wilcoxon signed ranks tests were applied to variables with normal and non-normal distributions, respectively. Furthermore, effect sizes (Cohen’s *d*) were calculated²⁹ and interpreted as: < 0.25 = trivial, $0.25-0.50$ = small, $0.50-1.0$ = moderate, and > 1.0 = large, given participants’ longstanding participation in the sport.³⁰ To evaluate individual responses, players exhibiting changes in excess of the minimal detectable change (MDC) – calculated as $[(1.96 \times SEM) \times \sqrt{2}]$ ³¹ – were classified as ‘positive’ or ‘negative’ responders (dependent on the direction of change). Changes $< MDC$ were classified as ‘neutral’ responses. Correlations between asymmetry and performance in both the control and loaded warm-up conditions were examined using Spearman’s Rho and interpreted as: small = $0-0.3$, moderate = $0.31-0.49$, large = $0.50-0.69$, very large = $0.70-0.89$, and near perfect = $0.90-1.00$.³² The consistency of the asymmetry direction following the CWU and LWU conditions was evaluated using the kappa statistic and interpreted using thresholds outlined by Viera and Garrett³³ where: < 0 = poor, $0.01-0.20$ = slight, $0.21-0.40$ = fair, $0.41-0.60$ = moderate, $0.61-0.80$ = substantial, and $0.81-0.99$ = almost perfect.

RESULTS

Whilst CODS and SLCMJ performances were normally distributed, asymmetry values were not. As shown in Table 2, ICCs for all test measurements were “excellent” and CV values “acceptable”.

*** Table 2 Near Here ***

No significant differences between the CWU and LWU were observed for any variable (Table 3). “Small” effect sizes suggested faster CODS times (Figure 3) and lower asymmetries following LWU. Individual responses to the LWU are shown in Table 4.

*** Tables 3 & 4 Near Here ***

*** Figure 3 Near Here ***

Following CWU, SLCMJ asymmetry was not associated with CODS time or SLCMJ height (Table 5). However, following LWU, CODS and SLCMJ D were significantly correlated with asymmetry such that better performances were associated with larger asymmetries. Higher SLCMJ heights on both limbs were associated with faster CODS times following both warm-ups, but correlations were larger following LWU. There was “substantial” agreement for the direction of asymmetry following CWU vs LWU ($\kappa = 0.741$; $P < 0.001$) (Figure 4). Four players exhibited larger SLCMJ heights on the ND limb following both conditions whilst fifteen exhibited larger D limb performances. The remaining two players saw a change from ND dominance or parity in CWU to D dominance in LWU.

*** Figure 4 Near Here ***

*** Table 5 Near Here ***

DISCUSSION

The aim of the current study was to examine the effects of a LWU (10% body mass) on sport-specific CODS, SLCMJ performance and asymmetry in badminton players in comparison to a ‘traditional’ dynamic warm-up. The current study reports that the LWU did not yield any significant effect on performance or asymmetry in contrast to the experimental hypothesis. However, “small” effect sizes suggested faster CODS performances and lower asymmetries following LWU. Subsequent individual analysis revealed that the LWU induced CODS improvements greater than the MDC for almost a quarter of the cohort, but negatively impacted two players. As such, LWU may prove a strategy to trial on an individual basis but should not be more globally implemented given the potential for some athletes to respond negatively.

Across the cohort, players’ fastest CODS performances were not significantly faster following LWU versus CWU (4.89%; $P = 0.075$) although the observed variance within the test (CWU CV = 4.08%, LWU CV = 5.76%) increases the likelihood of type II error. The LWU protocol in the current study was based upon a previously used methodology. Maloney et al.¹⁴ reported that LWU with the same loading as the current study (10% body mass) resulted in a similar magnitude of improvement in badminton-specific CODS (5%; ES = 0.83) in professional players. It is likely that Maloney et al. observed significant improvements and a larger effect size in comparison to the current study as a result of less variance in the CODS test (SEM of 0.40 s in a shorter (~12-sec) test). Moreover, players in this investigation performed the CODS test ~20 minutes after the last warm-up exercise, far longer than the 6-8 minutes previously employed.^{14,15} This length of recovery has been demonstrated to elicit improvements following heavy resistance exercise but is longer than has been evaluated in regards to ballistic pre-conditioning interventions.⁴ The kinetics of fatigue-potential responses beyond 8-minutes¹⁵ are yet to be well examined following LWU and require direct investigation.

The worse reliability reported in the current study could be explained by the use of amateur players in comparison to professionals, or that the modified CODS test protocol is a less reliable test. The CODS assessment employed here was proposed by Paterson et al.²⁵ in an attempt to cover a more complete array of sport-specific movements. However, the reliability of this test versus the Hughes³⁴ assessment utilised by Maloney et al.¹⁴ has not been established. It is therefore not clear which test may prove a more sensitive measure of CODS performance for the badminton player and may prove a topic for future investigation. Turki et al.¹⁵ also examined the effect of LWU on CODS performance (20-m zig-zag test). The investigators reported that all LWU conditions (5, 10, and 15% BW) improved fastest (1.31-1.58%) and total (1.89-1.98%) CODS versus CWU, with no difference between loadings. Whilst the magnitude of change is lower than reported in the current study, so too were the CV values for the zig-zag test (1.04-1.49%) and likely explain the significance of the effect.

To the authors’ knowledge, this is the first investigation to report the effect of an acute exercise intervention on asymmetry. The LWU in the current study did not influence SLCMJ asymmetry in comparison to CWU. This perhaps not surprising as the preconditioning activity did not attempt to replicate kinetics or kinematics of the SLCMJ and performance improvements within the test may not be anticipated. However, one interesting finding was revealed. Whereas asymmetry was not associated with performance following CWU, correlations for both CODS and SLCMJ D with asymmetry were reported after LWU such that better performances were associated with larger asymmetries. This is the first study to show a significant relationship in this direction for CODS,

although larger pedal force asymmetries have been associated with improved cycling performance in one instance.³⁵ Previously, SLCMJ asymmetries have been associated with impaired CODS in youth tennis players¹⁷ and academy soccer players,¹⁸ although other investigations have observed no relationship in team-sport athletes.¹⁹⁻²²

It is not clear why asymmetry should directly influence performance in a positive or negative manner, aside from serving as a potential proxy for a neuromuscular deficiency.¹⁶ Longstanding participation in a highly unilaterally biased sport such as badminton is to be expected to result in asymmetric adaptations. For example, thicker and wider Achilles and patellar tendons in the racket leg.³⁶ As the magnitude of asymmetry would be anticipated to increase with playing age,²³ it may be expected that performance in sport-related tasks would too. This may explain why larger SLCMJ asymmetries were associated with better performances in the CODS test (representing sport-specific movement patterns) and the SLCMJ D (representative of neuromuscular capacity on the lunging leg), badminton players have adapted to perform these types of task. However, asymmetry was not associated with performance in the SLCMJ ND. As such, it is likely that badminton players have developed asymmetries which may be deemed ‘functional’ as they underpin performance within movement patterns associated with their sport. Nonetheless, the marked difference in the strength of the relationship (or lack thereof) in the CWU versus the LWU is hard to explain. The likelihood of a type I error should therefore not be discounted. Moreover, it is hard to explain why a small percentage ($n = 4$) of the cohort exhibited superior SLCMJ performance on their non-dominant limb.

It is important to note that the order of CWU and LWU were not counterbalanced in this investigation due to logistical constraints, this is a clear limitation. Given players’ familiarity with the movement patterns assessed by the CODS and SLCMJ tests, learning or practice effects are perhaps unlikely but, again, should not be discounted. In addition, the study was unable to control for individual differences between participants such as strength, badminton ability/training age, or discipline (singles, same-sex doubles, and mixed doubles).

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

Whilst a significant effect of the LWU was not observed, several individuals responded in a positive manner and a “small” positive effect was reported. As such, LWU may prove a strategy to trial on an individual basis. However, given the potential for some athletes to respond negatively to LWU, generic recommendations should not be applied across groups of athletes. Moreover, it is important to consider that CODS was tested ~20 minutes following the LWU which is unlikely to be representative of a typical post-warm-up recovery duration. It was further observed that larger asymmetries were associated with faster CODS performances following LWU. For this reason, typical recommendations to reduce asymmetries with a view to enhancing performance do not appear to be justified in badminton players.

CONCLUSIONS

The current study reported no significant effect of a LWU (10% BW) on CODS performance or SLCMJ asymmetry versus a CWU in amateur badminton players. Nonetheless, a “small” effect size suggested faster CODS following LWU and several individuals responded in a positive manner. In addition, it was also observed that larger asymmetries were associated with faster CODS performances following LWU. This is the first investigation to examine the association between asymmetry and CODS in badminton, a highly asymmetric sport.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

The results of the current study do not constitute endorsement of any product by the authors or the journal.

REFERENCES

1. Fradkin, A.J., T.R. Zazryn, and J.M. Smoliga, Effects of warming-up on physical performance: a systematic review with meta analysis. *J Str Cond Res.* 2010, **24**: p. 140-148.
2. Blazevich, A.J. and N. Babault, Post-activation potentiation versus post-activation performance enhancement in humans: historical perspective, underlying mechanisms, and current issues. *Front Physiol.* 2019, **10**: p. 1359.
3. Cuenca-Fernández, F., et al., Nonlocalized postactivation Perform enhancement (PAPE) effects in trained athletes: a pilot study. *App Physiol Nutr Me.* 2017, **42**: p. 1122-1125.
4. Maloney, S.J., A.N. Turner, and I.M. Fletcher, Ballistic exercise as a pre-activation stimulus: a review of the literature and practical applications. *Sport Med.* 2014, **44**: p. 1347-1359.
5. Phomsoupha, M. and G. Laffaye, The Sci of badminton: game characteristics, anthropometry, physiology, visual fitness and biomechanics. *Sport Med.* 2015, **45**: p. 473-495.
6. Tiwari, L.M., V. Rai, and S. Srinet, Relationship of selected motor fitness components with the performance of the badminton player. *Asian J Phys Edu Comp Sci Sport.* 2011, **5**: p. 88-91.
7. Zois, J., et al., High-intensity warm-ups elicit superior improvements to a current soccer warm-up routine. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2011, **14**: p. 522-528.
8. Faigenbaum, A.D., et al., Dynamic warm-up protocols, with and without a weighted vest, and fitness Perform in high school female athletes. *J Ath Train.* 2006, **41**: p. 357-363.
9. Tahayori, B., *Effects of exercising with a weighted vest on the output of lower limb joints in countermovement jumping*, 2009, Louisiana State University: United States.
10. Thompsen, A.G., et al., Acute effects of different warm-up protocols with and without a weighted vest on jumping performance in athletic women. *J Str Cond Res.* 2007, **21**: p. 52-56.
11. Hughes, J.D., R.G. Massiah, and R.D. Clarke, The potentiating effect of an accentuated eccentric load on countermovement jump performance. *J Str Cond Res.* 2016, **30**: p. 3450-3455.
12. Simperingham, K.D., et al., Acute changes in sprint running performance following ballistic exercise with added lower body loading. *J Aus Str Cond.* 2015, **23**: p. 86-89.
13. Chattong, C., et al., Effect of a dynamic loaded warm up on vertical jump performance. *J Str Cond Res.* 2010, **24**: p. 1751-1754.
14. Maloney, S.J., A.N. Turner, and S. Miller, Acute effects of a loaded warm-up protocol on change of direction speed in professional badminton players. *J App Biomech.* 2014, **30**: p. 637-642.
15. Turki, O., et al., Dynamic warm-up with a weighted vest: improvement of repeated change-of-direction performance in young male soccer players. *Int J Sport Physiol Perform.* 2019. [doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2018-0800].
16. Maloney, S.J., The relationship between asymmetry and performance: a critical review. *J Str Cond Res.* 2019, **33**: p. 2579-2593.
17. Madruga-Parera, M., et al., Interlimb asymmetries in youth tennis players: relationships with performance. *J Str Cond Res.* 2019. [doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003152].

18. Bishop, C., et al., Jumping asymmetries are associated with speed, change of direction speed, and jump performance in elite academy soccer players. *J Str Cond Res*. 2019. [doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003058].
19. Madruga-Parera, M., et al., Jumping-based asymmetries are negatively associated with jump, change of direction, and repeated sprint performance, but not linear speed, in adolescent handball athletes. *J Hum Kinet*. 2020, **71**: p. 47-58.
20. Madruga-Parera, M., et al., Relationship between inter-limb asymmetries and speed and change of direction speed in youth handball players. *J Str Cond Res*. 2019. [doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003328].
21. Bishop, C., et al., Drop jump asymmetry is associated with reduced sprint and change-of-direction speed performance in adult female soccer players. *Sport*. 2019, **7**: p. 29.
22. Bishop, C., et al., Effects of interlimb asymmetries on acceleration and change of direction speed: a between-sport comparison of professional soccer and cricket athletes. *J Str Cond Res*. 2019. [doi: 10.1519/JSC.0000000000003135].
23. Hart, N.H., et al., Musculoskeletal asymmetry in football athletes: a product of limb function over time. *Med Sci Sport Ex*. 2016, **48**: p. 1379-1387.
24. Beck, T.W., The importance of a priori sample size estimation in strength and conditioning research. *J Str Cond Res*. 2013, **27**: p. 2323-2337.
25. Paterson, S., D.T. McMaster, and J. Cronin, Assessing change of direction ability in badminton athletes. *Str Cond J*. 2016, **38**: p. 18-30.
26. Bishop, C., et al., Interlimb asymmetries: understanding how to calculate differences from bilateral and unilateral tests. *Str Cond J*. 2018, **40**: p. 1-6.
27. Koo, T.K. and M.Y. Li, A guideline of selecting and reporting intraclass correlation coefficients for reliability Res. *J Chiro Med*. 2016, **15**: p. 155-163.
28. Cormack, S.J., et al., Reliability of measures obtained during single and repeated countermovement jumps. *Int J Sport Physiol Perform*. 2008, **3**: p. 131-144.
29. Cohen, J., *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral Scis*. 2nd ed1988, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
30. Rhea, M.R., Determining the magnitude of treatment effects in strength training research through the use of effect size. *J Str Cond Res*. 2004, **18**: p. 918-920.
31. Monteiro, E.R., et al., Acute effects of different anterior thigh self-massage on hip range-of-motion in trained men. *Int J Sport Phys Ther*. 2018, **13**: p. 104-113.
32. Hopkins, W.G. *A scale of magnitude for effect sizes*. 2006 07 August 2006 [cited 2019 11 October]; Available from: <http://www.sportsci.org/resource/stats/effectmag.html>.
33. Viera, A.J. and J.M. Garrett, Understanding interobserver agreement: the kappa statistic. *Fam Med*. 2005, **37**: p. 360-363.
34. Hughes, M.G., *Field-based Assessment of Speed and Power in Junior Badminton Players*, in *Sci and Racket Sports IV*, A. Lees, D. Cabello, and G. Torres, Editors. 2009, Routledge: Oxon. p. 70-76.
35. Bini, R.R. and P.A. Hume, Relationship between pedal force asymmetry and perform in cycling time trial. *J Sport Med Phys Fit*. 2015, **55**: p. 892-898.
36. Bravo-Sánchez, A., et al., Myotendinous asymmetries derived from the prolonged practice of badminton in professional players. *PLoS ONE*. 2019, **14**: p. e0222190.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1 – A schematic of the study design. Key: SLCMJ = single leg countermovement jump, CODS = change of direction speed.

Figure 2 – The half-court set-up for badminton-specific change of direction test performed by the participants.

Figure 3 – The mean (bold black line) and individual differences in change of direction test (CODS) time between control and loaded warm-up conditions. Negative values indicate a faster time in the loaded condition.

Figure 4 – The magnitude and direction of individual athletes' single leg countermovement jump (SLCMJ) height asymmetries following the control (CWU) and loaded warm-up (LWU). Positive values indicate a higher jump on the dominant limb, negative values indicate a higher jump on the non-dominant limb.

Table 1: The dynamic warm-up protocol completed by players in both conditions.

Component	Exercise #	Exercise
Dynamic stretches	1	Walking on toes
	2	Walking on heels
	3	Walking knee to chest
	4	Walking knee to chest with internal rotation
	5	Walking hip circles — medial to lateral
	6	Walking hip circles — lateral to medial
	7	Walking lunge & rotate
	8	Walking deep lunge
	9	Walking sumo squats
Pulse raiser	10	Jogging with high knees
	11	Jogging with butt kicks
	12	Fast feet running
	13, 14, 15	Repeat 10, 11, 12 backward
	16, 17	Side steps (× 2 — alternate lead foot)
	18, 19	Carioca steps (× 2 — alternate lead foot)
Speed & power priming	20*	Bilateral countermovement jumps (× 5 reps)
	21*	Alternating split squat jumps (×5 reps each leg)
	22*	4-corners shadow play drill (× 2 circuits)

* indicates the three ‘experimental’ exercises – these were performed without additional load in the control condition (CWU) and loaded with a weighted vest in the experimental condition (LWU).

Table 2 Reliability of performance outcomes in both warm-up conditions.

Variable	CWU			LWU		
	ICC (95%CI)	SEM	CV	ICC (95%CI)	SEM	CV
CODS (s)	0.969 (0.922 to 0.987)	0.49	4.08%	0.924 (0.739 to 0.973)	0.70	5.76%
SLCMJ D (cm)	0.972 (0.943 to 0.988)	0.63	6.42%	0.969 (0.936 to 0.986)	0.64	4.84%
SLCMJ ND (cm)	0.974 (0.948 to 0.989)	0.56	6.68%	0.967 (0.933 to 0.986)	0.59	6.22%

Abbreviations: CWU = control condition, LWU = loaded warm-up condition, CODS = badminton change of direction speed test, SLCMJ = single leg countermovement jump, D = dominant limb, ND = non-dominant limb, ICC = intraclass correlation coefficient, CI = confidence intervals, SEM = standard error of measurement, CV = coefficient of variation.

Table 3 Differences in group mean performances and SLCMJ jump asymmetry between control and loaded warm-up conditions.

Variable	Post-CWU	Post-LWU	P value	Effect size (95%CI)
CODS (s)	16.58 ± 2.80	15.77 ± 2.16	0.075	-0.32 (-0.93 to 0.29)
SLCMJ D (cm)	16.30 ± 3.88	16.55 ± 3.78	0.345	0.06 (-0.54 to 0.67)
Best SLCMJ ND (cm)	14.85 ± 3.45	15.50 ± 3.24	0.067	0.20 (-0.42 to 0.80)
SLCMJ ASYM (%)	12.98 ± 7.66	9.96 ± 7.75	0.140	-0.39 (-0.99 to 0.23)

Abbreviations: CWU = control condition, LWU = loaded warm-up condition, CODS = badminton change of direction speed test, SLCMJ = single leg countermovement jump, D = dominant limb, ND = non-dominant limb, ASYM = asymmetry.

Table 4. Individual responses to the loaded warm-up condition in comparison to the control warm-up.

Variable	Positive (n =)	Neutral (n =)	Negative (n =)
CODS	5	14	2
SLCMJ D	2	19	0
SLCMJ ND	5	15	1

Abbreviations: CODS = badminton change of direction speed test, SLCMJ = single leg countermovement jump, D = dominant limb, ND = non-dominant limb.

Positive and negative response defined as a change greater than the minimal detectable difference.

Table 5: Correlations (Spearman's Rho (ρ)) between selected variables following the control and loaded warm-up conditions.

Condition		Asymmetry vs __			CODS vs __	
		CODS	SLCMJ D	SLCMJ ND	SLCMJ D	SLCMJ ND
Post-	ρ	0.079	0.098	-0.144	-0.600**	-0.535*
CWU	p	0.733	0.672	0.533	0.004	0.012
Post-	ρ	-0.491*	0.497*	0.174	-0.730**	-0.654**
LWU	p	0.035	0.022	0.450	< 0.001	0.001

Abbreviations: CWU = control condition, LWU = loaded warm-up condition, CODS = badminton change of direction speed test, SLCMJ = single leg countermovement jump, D = dominant limb, ND = non-dominant limb, ASYM = asymmetry, *= Significant ($p \leq 0.05$) of the correlation. **= Significant ($p \leq 0.01$) of the correlation.

Figure 1:




Figure 2:




Figure 3:




Figure 4:

